

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated June 6, 2011. By way of this amendment, Claims 66, 68, and 70-87 are pending in this application, of which Claims 66, 84, and 85 are the independent claims. Claims 66 and 81-85 are amended herein. No new matter has been added. Support for the claim amendments can be found throughout the originally filed application, including, for example, in paragraphs [40]-[43] and Figure 3 of the application. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claim Objections

Claims 66, 84, and 85 are objected to because the limitation “wherein communications occurring through the first communication channel are suspended when the communication session is locked” is alleged to be an essential repeat of the limitations “the lock session signal configured to restrict access to the communication session until the computing device receives an unlock session signal from the remotely located computing device,” and “wherein the computing device is configured to facilitate communication of the communications session using a first communication channel.” Applicants respectfully disagree with this objection.

The limitations “the lock session signal configured to restrict access to the communication session until the computing device receives an unlock session signal from the other computing device,” and “wherein the computing device is configured to facilitate communication of the communications session using a first communication channel,” describe, for example, that:

- a lock session signal is configured to restrict access to a communication session;
- when an unlock session signal is received, the lock session signal is configured to no longer restrict access to a communication session; and
- communication of the communications session is facilitated using a first communication channel.

Application No.: 10/787,227

On the other hand, the limitation “wherein communications occurring through the first communication channel are suspended when the communication session is locked” describes, for example, that:

- communications through the first communication channel are suspended when the communications session is locked.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the variously cited limitations are not essential repeats of one another. Applicants respectfully request that the objection to Claims 66, 84, and 85 be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C § 112, Second Paragraph

Claims 66, 84, and 85 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that Applicants regard as the invention.

Without conceding the correctness of the rejection, and in order to expedite prosecution, Applicants have amended independent Claims 66, 84, and 85, and Claims 81-83 which depend from Claim 66, to change the description of the “remotely located computing device” to “other computing device.” Applicants respectfully submit that such description is in accordance with the claims, Abstract, and Figure 3, as cited in the Office Action.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 66, 84, and 85 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C § 103

Claims 66, 68, 70, 72-74, 77-82, 84, and 85 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,244,957 (“Walker”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,145,083 (“Shaffer”) and further in view of U.S. Pat. Appln. Pub. No. 2005/0080915

Application No.: 10/787,227

(“Shoemaker”). Claims 71 and 76 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Walker in view of Shaffer and further in view of Shoemaker and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,854,009 (“Hughes”). Claim 75 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Walker in view of Shaffer and further in view of Shoemaker, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,876,644 (“Hsu”). Claims 83 and 86 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Walker in view of Shaffer and further in view of Shoemaker, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,089,508 (“Wright”). Claim 87 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Walker in view of Shaffer and further in view of Shoemaker, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,219,233 (“Hendriks”). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Each of the independent claims recites a “computing device [that] is configured to facilitate communication of [a] communications session using a first communication channel, and [that] is configured to facilitate communication of [a] lock session signal, [an] unlock session signal, and [] identification information using a second communication channel, and wherein communications occurring through the first communication channel are suspended when the communications session is locked.” It is respectfully submitted that the applied references, whether alone or in combination, in view of what was known to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, do not teach or suggest at least these limitations of the independent claims.

The Office Action on page 7 contends that Walker discloses suspending communications occurring through a first communication channel when a communication session is locked, but on page 9 concedes that neither Walker nor Shaffer disclose using a second communication channel to communicate a lock session signal to lock the first communication channel, as

featured in each of the pending independent claims. The Office Action contends that Shoemaker remedies this deficiency of Walker and Shaffer, namely, that Shoemaker in FIG. 1B and paragraph [0087] discloses facilitating communication of a secure communications session using a first communication channel and configured to facilitate communication of a lock session signal, an unlock session signal, and identification information using a second communication channel. Applicants respectfully disagree with these contentions.

Firstly, Shoemaker does not teach or even suggest using a second communication channel to communicate a lock session signal to lock a first communication channel as featured in each of the pending independent claims. Shoemaker in FIG. 1B discloses a user-interface channel 210 and a media channel 208. Regarding these channels, Shoemaker discloses:

To transmit [a] computing experience 202 in high quality, the user interface is communicated through a user-interface channel 210 and the media component(s) 206 are communicated through a media channel 208 via network 211....

User-interface channel 210 communicates user-interface component 204 to remote component 212. Terminal Server and Terminal Client Services, offered by Microsoft Corporation of Redmond, Wash., provide an exemplary user-interface channel 210. Any remotable protocol can be used to transmit data through user-interface channel 210. Exemplary protocols include the T-120 series protocol and HTTP (Hyper Text Transfer Protocol).

Media channel 208 is separate from user-interface channel 210. Media channel 208 is used to transmit bandwidth-intensive experiences such as video and others listed above.

Shoemaker, paragraphs [0008], [0015], and [0016]. Shoemaker in paragraph [0087] discloses that the Remote Desktop Protocol (RDP) “is a multichannel capable protocol allowing for separate virtual channels for carrying serial device communication and presentation data from the server.” Shoemaker does not, however, anywhere teach or even suggest communications occurring through a first communication channel for a communications session are suspended when a communications session is locked using a second communication channel. For example, Shoemaker does not teach or even suggest suspending communications occurring through one of

the user-interface channel 210, the media channel 208, or a virtual channel of RDP for a communication session when the communications session is locked using a different communication channel.

Secondly, assuming, *arguendo*, that Walker discloses suspending communications occurring through a first communication channel when a communication session is locked, which Applicants do not concede, then the combination of Shoemaker with Walker, with or without Shaffer, would not still not teach or suggest a “computing device [that] is configured to facilitate communication of [a] communications session using a first communication channel, and [that] is configured to facilitate communication of [a] lock session signal, [an] unlock session signal, and [] identification information using a second communication channel, and wherein communications occurring through the first communication channel are suspended when the communications session is locked,” because, as discussed above, none of the applied references teach or suggest using a second communication channel to communicate a lock session signal to lock a first communication channel.

The remaining references, Hughes, Hsu, Wright, and Hendriks, are not understood to remedy the foregoing deficiencies of Walker, Shaffer, and Shoemaker. Specifically, the remaining references, whether alone or in combination, in view of what was known to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, do not teach or suggest at least the limitations of a “computing device [that] is configured to facilitate communication of [a] communications session using a first communication channel, and [that] is configured to facilitate communication of [a] lock session signal, [an] unlock session signal, and [] identification information using a second communication channel, and wherein communications

occurring through the first communication channel are suspended when the communications session is locked,” recited in each of the independent claims.

Accordingly, the applied references, either alone or in combination, in view of what was known to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, are not understood to disclose, teach, or suggest the features of the independent claims, which are believed to be in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of the independent claims are respectfully requested.

The other claims currently under consideration in the application are dependent from the independent claims discussed above and therefore are believed to be allowable over the applied references for at least similar reasons. Because each dependent claim is deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, the individual consideration of each on its own merits is respectfully requested. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the dependent claims are respectfully requested.

The absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue, or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue, or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be other reasons for patentability of any or all claims that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede, or an actual concession of, any issue with regard to any claim, or any cited art, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment or cancellation of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment or cancellation.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience. Should the Examiner have any questions, please call the undersigned at the phone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 502624 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP

/Soyeon (Karen) Pak Laub/
Soyeon (Karen) Pak Laub, Registration No. 39,266

18191 Von Karman Ave., Suite 500
Irvine, CA 92612-7108
Phone: 949.851.0633 AAS:kcc
Facsimile: 949.851.9348
Date: September 6, 2011
DM_US 29279859-2.049051.0221

**Please recognize our Customer No. 31824
as our correspondence address.**